

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

WARREN CHASE #231139 :

v.

: CIVIL ACTION NO. CCB-98-2367 ✓

PHLONDA J. PEAY, et al. :

\* \* \* \* \*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

WARREN CHASE #231139 :

v.

: CIVIL ACTION NO. CCB-98-3280

JACK KAVANAGH, et al. :

\* \* \* \* \*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

WARREN CHASE #231139 :

v.

: CIVIL ACTION NO. CCB-99-3569

THOMAS R. CORCORAN, et al. :

\* \* \* \* \*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

WARREN CHASE #231139 :

v.

: CIVIL ACTION NO. CCB-99-3668

THOMAS R. CORCORAN, et al. :

\* \* \* \* \*

9/22/00  
ms

FILED  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND  
2000 SEP 21 P 12:11  
DEPUTY CLERK

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

WARREN CHASE #231139 :  
v. : CIVIL ACTION NO. CCB-00-470  
THOMAS R. CORCORAN, et al. :

\* \* \* \* \*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

WARREN CHASE #231139 :  
v. : CIVIL ACTION NO. CCB-00-853  
WARDEN, MCAC, et al. :

\* \* \* \* \*


**ORDER**

Plaintiff Warren Chase has filed identical Motions for Protective Orders in each of the above-captioned cases. (*See, respectively*, Paper Nos. 80, 6, 6, 6, 3 and 11). He claims that since August 23, 2000 he has been "harassed" by correctional officers; placed in restraints for several hours at a time; denied recreation; and deprived of lunch. He claims that these events have occurred since his August 23, 2000 deposition in connection with some or all of the above-

Preliminarily, the Court notes that Civil Action Nos. CCB-98-3280, CCB-99-3569, CCB-99-3668, CCB-00-470 and CCB-00-853 have been administratively closed, pending resolution of CCB-98-2367. Thus it is unlikely that depositions were conducted in connection with those cases. In CCB-98-2367, plaintiff is represented by counsel. If plaintiff believes he has suffered retaliation from prison personnel due to his involvement in that case, he should contact counsel to discuss any appropriate actions to be undertaken in connection with that case.

Accordingly, **IT IS** this 21<sup>st</sup> day of September 2000 by this Court hereby **ORDERED:**

1. That the motions for protective orders filed in the above-captioned cases **ARE DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**; and
2. That the Clerk of Court **MAIL** a copy of this Order to plaintiff; to plaintiff's attorney in CCB-98-2367; and to all other counsel of record.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Catherine C. Blake  
United States District Judge